



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,991	08/09/2001	Gopal N. Iyer	60027.0022US01	4754

39262 7590 06/01/2005
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

HANNE, SARA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,991

Applicant(s)

IYER, GOPAL N.

Examiner

Sara M Hanne

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment received on February 7, 2005.

Examiner herein notes Claims 1-9 and 11-20 pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Munguia et al., US Patent 6381644.

As in Claims 1, 8, 12 and 19, Munguia et al. teaches a computer implemented method and computer-readable medium with computer-readable instructions for receiving form name input (Fig. 8, Fig 9a) which corresponds to data stored on a plurality of forms in a cellular site information database, in response to receiving form name input, displaying on a display device a blank one of the forms on which the data corresponding to the received form name input is stored (Fig 9b) and receiving a key field on the displayed form which corresponds to a cellular site ("user ID" field 439, 532), then generating queries to retrieve data (search criteria) corresponding to the form name input and the identified cellular site from the database (Column 15, line 25 et seq.), and sending the queries to the database and receiving the data corresponding to the form name input and identified cellular site from the database and displaying this

data (Column 18, lines 31-39) on a displayed form, and receiving user input editing the data, generating and sending commands corresponding to user input to edit cellular site data in the information database (Figure 9g and corresponding text, Column 16, line 26 et seq.).

As in Claim 2, Munguia et al. teaches the key field is input by a user (Figure 9 and corresponding text).

As in Claim 9, Munguia et al. teaches the form name input is a channel (Figure 9g and corresponding text)

As in Claims 5-6, it is inherently included in Munguia et al. for the queries to be several line commands executed by a command handler application with interfaces in conjunction with a cellular site information database. A command handler application is necessary to handle user-inputted commands, which are taught by Munguia et al. (requests made by the mobile subscriber, See also Claim 1 rejection *supra*).

As in Claim 13, Munguia et al. teaches the update application program module operative to transmit commands to the cellular processor (Fig. 9g and corresponding text, Column 16, line 26 et seq.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munguia et al., US Patent 6381644.

Munguia et al., discloses separating the information selected from the rest of the document. Munguia et al., fails to teach and Ericsson database and Operation supports system as recited in the claims. Within the field of the invention, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an Ericsson database and Operation Support system with the invention since the Assignee for the Munguia et al. Patent is MCI WorldCom, a communications company. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a query interface for use in a specific database system would have been obtained.

6. Claims 4 and 11, 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munguia et al., US Patent 6381644, and further in view of Cambray et al., US Patent 5577112.

Munguia et al. teaches a method for querying cellular site information databases according to specified key field form name input and editing of this data as in Claims 1, 12 and 19. While Munguia et al. teaches cellular site information database querying and editing, they fail to show the use of either SQL commands (specifically update, review, insert and delete), as recited in Claims 4, 11, 14-18 and 20, or a command handler application to execute commands in conjunction with the cellular site database as recited in claims 5-6. In the same field of the invention, Cambray et al. teaches a telecommunication management system similar to that of Munguia et al. In addition, Cambray et al. further teaches the queries are completed using SQL commands (via an

Art Unit: 2179

interactive query language such as by standard query language (SQL) commands.”, Column 3, lines 53-55) as in Claims 4, 11, 14, 20, specifically editing commands such as update (modify), review (list), insert and delete (Column 6, lines 28-32) as in claims 15-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Munguia et al. and Cambray et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the querying method using form name input taught by Munguia et al. to include the SQL commands of Cambray et al., in order to obtain a query system implemented using a structured query language. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because an efficient query system of cellular site databases would have been obtained, as taught by Cambray et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to the Claim amendments, the rejections of the independent claims with respect to previously applied reference have been altered to show that Munguia still discloses the subject matter of the independent claims as seen *supra*.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar user interfaces for querying and editing cellular site information databases.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara M Hanne whose telephone number is (571) 272-4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

Art Unit: 2179

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smh


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100